



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,441	07/09/2003	Kevin L. Parsons	8342-89538	9148

24628 7590 11/22/2005

WELSH & KATZ, LTD
120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA
22ND FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

WARD, JOHN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2875

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/616,441

Applicant(s)

PARSONS, KEVIN L.

Examiner

John A. Ward

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 48-52, 59 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalton et al (US 6,070,990) in view of Herman (US 5,685,630).

Regarding claim 48, Dalton et al ('990) discloses a personally portable flashlight comprising of a light emitting diode 36 having a first and second leads 38, 40, a power source 30 having a first and second side, a body 21 made of polymeric material (column 2, lines 14-20) to receive the battery (figure 3) and column 3, lines 1-9 teaches that a switch is operable to closes a circuit including a light source and power supply.

Regarding claims 49, 50, 51 and 60, Dalton et al discloses that the body 21, at least one sides covers 12, is made of polymeric material, and at least one cover is made of a polycarbonate (column 2, lines 12-20).

Regarding claim 52 Dalton discloses a decorative element 20 is placed beneath on a side cover (figure 2).

Regarding claim 59, Dalton et al in figure 3 shows how the frames and side covers are integrally formed together.

Regarding claims 48-52, Dalton et al does not disclose the body of the cover having at least one or two sides being made of a translucent material.

Regarding claims 48-52, Herman ('630) discloses a battery-operated lighting device having a first and second body 1, 1A, a battery 11A, a light source 15A and in claim 1 of the prior art of Herman teaches that at least one of the bodies are translucent.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the flashlight of Dalton et al with the battery operated lighting device of Herman having a translucent body in order to provide a light that have two basic enclosure elements made of a polymeric material and having labeling as taught by Dalton et al (abstract).

Also it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art since it old and well known to use a translucent or transparent side covers is a matter of a design selection and would work equally well with either type of cover or a mater of decorative choice.

Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalton et al (US 6,070,990) in view of Herman (US 5,685,630).

Regarding claim 62, Dalton et al ('990) discloses a personally portable flashlight comprising of a light emitting diode 36 having a first and second leads 38, 40, a power source 30 having a first and second side, a body 21 made of polymeric material (column 2, lines 14-20) to receive the battery (figure 3) and column 3, lines 1-9 teaches that a switch is operable to closes a circuit including a light source and power supply.

Regarding claim 62, Dalton et al does not disclose the body of the cover having at least one or two sides being made of a translucent material.

Regarding claim 62, Herman ('630) discloses a battery-operated lighting device having a first and second body 1, 1A, a battery 11A, a light source 15A and in claim 1 of the prior art of Herman it teaches that at least one of the bodies are translucent.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the flashlight of Dalton et al with the battery operated lighting device of Herman having a translucent body in order to provide a light that have two basic enclosure elements made of a polymeric material and having labeling as taught by Dalton et al (abstract).

Also it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art since it old and well known to use a translucent or transparent side covers is a matter of a design selection and would work equally well with either type of cover or a mater of decorative choice.

Claim 65, 66 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalton et al (US 6,070,990) in view of Herman (US 5,685,630).

Regarding claim 65, Dalton et al ('990) discloses a flashlight comprising of a light emitting diode 36 having a first and second leads 38, 40, a power source 30 having a first and second side, a body 21 made of polymeric material (column 2, lines 14-20) to

receive the battery (figure 3) and column 3, lines 1-9 teaches that a switch is operable to closes a circuit including a light source and power supply.

Regarding claim 66 Dalton et al discloses a decorative element 20 is placed beneath on a side cover (figure 2).

Regarding claim 70, Dalton et al in figure 3 shows how the frames and side covers are integrally formed together.

Regarding claims 65, 66, and 70, Dalton et al does not disclose the body of the cover having at least one or two sides being made of a translucent material.

Regarding claim 65, 66, and 70, Herman ('630) discloses a battery-operated lighting device having a first and second body 1, 1A, a battery 11A, a light source 15A and in claim 1 of the prior art of Herman teaches that at least one of the bodies are translucent.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the flashlight of Dalton et al with the battery operated lighting device of Herman having a translucent body in order to provide a light that have two basic enclosure elements made of a polymeric material and having labeling as taught by Dalton et al (abstract).

Claims 53-58, 60, 61, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalton et al in view of Herman as applied to claims 49 and 52 above, and further in view of Vandebelt et al (US 5,457,613) and in view of Holat (US 6,036,810).

Regarding claims 53-58, 60, 61, 63 and 64 Dalton et al in view of Herman discloses all the limitations of the claimed invention as cited above including a light source, body and power source, but does not disclose the a decorative foil placed beneath at least one translucent side cover.

Regarding claims 53-55, 61 and 63, Vandebelt et al ('613) discloses a card light flashlight comprising of a light source 26, a power source 22, and a cover 54 that houses a casing 14 that houses the light source and power source and column 4, lines 2-7, teaches that an imprinted media may be apply to the casing.

Regarding claims 53 and 55-57 does not disclose a holographic foil sheet.

Regarding claims 53 and 55-57, Holat ('810) discloses holographic foil sheet 10 having a decorative image 12.

Regarding claims 58, 60 and 64, Vandebelt in view of Holat does not disclose that the covers are dent resistant and made of a polycarbonate.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the casing of a polycarbonate material being dent resistant, since it has been held to be with in the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability of the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. ***In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.***

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the LED flashlight of Dalton et al with the decorative flashlight of Vandebelt et al along with the holographic stamp of Holat in

order to provide a flashlight that is small and decorative as taught by Vandebelt (column 2, lines 10-15).

Also it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art since it old and well known to use a translucent or transparent side covers is a matter of a design selection and would work equally well with either type of cover or a matter of decorative choice.

Claims 67-69, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalton et al in view of Herman as applied to claims 65 above, and further in view of Vandebelt et al (US 5,457,613) and in view of Holat (US 6,036,810).

Regarding claims 67-69 and 71 Dalton et al in view of Herman discloses all the limitations of the claimed invention as cited above including a light source, body and power source, but does not discloses the a decorative foil placed beneath at least one translucent side cover.

Regarding claim 71, Vandebelt et al ('613) discloses a card light flashlight comprising of a light source 26, a power source 22, and a cover 54 that houses a casing 14 that houses the light source and power source and column 4, lines 2-7, teaches that an imprinted media may be apply to the casing.

Regarding claims 67-68 does not disclose a holographic foil sheet.

Regarding claims 67-68, Holat ('810) discloses holographic foil sheet 10 having a decorative image 12.

Regarding claim 69, Vandebelt in view of Holat does not disclose that the covers are dent resistant and made of a polycarbonate.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the casing of a polycarbonate material being dent resistant, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability of the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. ***In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.***

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the LED flashlight of Dalton et al with the decorative flashlight of Vandembelt et al along with the holographic stamp of Holat in order to provide a flashlight that is small and decorative as taught by Vandembelt (column 2, lines 10-15).

Also it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art since it old and well known to use a translucent or transparent side covers is a matter of a design selection and would work equally well with either type of cover or a matter of decorative choice.

Claims 72-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalton et al in view of Herman in view of Vandembelt et al (US 5,457,613) and in view of Holat (US 6,036,810).

Regarding claim 72, Dalton et al ('990) discloses a personally portable flashlight comprising of a light emitting diode 36 having a first and second leads 38, 40, a power source 30 having a first and second side, a body 21 made of polymeric material (column

Art Unit: 2875

2, lines 14-20) to receive the battery (figure 3) and column 3, lines 1-9 teaches that a switch is operable to closes a circuit including a light source and power supply.

Regarding claim 72, Dalton et al does not disclose the body of the cover having at least one or two sides being made of a translucent material.

Regarding claim 72, Herman ('630) discloses a battery-operated lighting device having a first and second body 1, 1A, a battery 11A, a light source 15A and in claim 1 of the prior art of Herman teaches that at least one of the bodies are translucent.

Regarding claims 72-76 Dalton et al in view of Herman discloses all the limitations of the claimed invention as cited above including a light source, body and power source, but does not discloses the a decorative foil placed beneath at least one translucent side cover.

Regarding claims 72-73 and 75, Vandebelt et al ('613) discloses a card light flashlight comprising of a light source 26, a power source 22, and a cover 54 that houses a casing 14 that houses the light source and power source and column 4, lines 2-7, teaches that an imprinted media may be apply to the casing.

Regarding claim 73 does not disclose a holographic foil sheet.

Regarding claim 73, Holat ('810) discloses holographic foil sheet 10 having a decorative image 12.

Regarding claims 74 and 76, Vandebelt in view of Holat does not disclose that the covers are dent resistant and made of a polycarbonate.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the casing of a polycarbonate material being dent

resistant, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the LED flashlight of Dalton et al with the decorative flashlight of Vandebelt et al along with the holographic stamp of Holat in order to provide a flashlight that is small and decorative as taught by Vandebelt (column 2, lines 10-15).

Also it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art since it is old and well known to use a translucent or transparent side covers is a matter of design selection and would work equally well with either type of cover or a matter of decorative choice.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 48, 62, 65 and 72 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of copending Application No. 10/045,231. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the ('231) in the claims cite a light emitting diode, a power source, a housing enclosing the battery and light source, the housing having a first and second side and a switch next to the power source.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 21, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 48-52, 59 and 60 the argument that on page 9 that Dalton does not disclose a side cover having a translucent side cover, it is true that Dalton does not disclose a side cover having a translucent side cover however this deficiency is met by the prior art of Herman which disclose a portable flashlight.

Regarding claims 48-52, 59, 60 62, 65, 66 and 70 (see pages 10 and 11) the argument that the reference of Herman does not teach a flashlight (see page 9 of arguments), in Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary Circa 1994 the word "portable" is defined as "easily carried or moved" (page 916) and word "flashlight" is defined as a small portable lamp" as broadly interpreted the prior art of Herman is a portable flashlight which can be mounted inside an interior surface which makes the

prior art pertinent since are portable flashlight on of ordinary skill in the art would combine the two prior of Dalton with Herman since each are analogous art.

Regarding claims 62, 65, 66 and 70 that the Dalton et al in view of Herman reference that Dalton does not teach the use of one or more translucent side covers of Herman are translucent and would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art since it old and well known to use a translucent or transparent side covers are a matter of a design selection and would work equally well with either type of cover or a mater of decorative choice.

Regarding claims In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both the Dalton and Herman references are analogous as flashlight and the rejection is pertinent and stands.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John A. Ward whose telephone number is 571-272-2386. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571-272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAW
November 21, 2005



JOHN ANTHONY WARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER